UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
Alexandria Division

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
:
-vs: Case No. 1:18-mj-402
:
BYRAMJI M. JAVAT,
Defendant.
:

DETENTION HEARING

August 22, 2018

Before: Theresa C. Buchanan, U.S. Mag. Judge

## APPEARANCES:

Jason A. Reding, Counsel for the United States
Gregory S. Smith, Counsel for the Defendant
The Defendant, Byramji M. Javat, in person

```
2
 1
               NOTE: The case is called to be heard at 2:05 p.m. as
 2
     follows:
 3
               THE CLERK: The United States versus Byramji Moneck
 4
     Javat, case 18-mj-402.
 5
               MR. REDING: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Jason
 6
    Reding for the United States.
 7
               MR. SMITH: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Greg Smith
 8
     representing Mr. Javat.
 9
               THE COURT: Good afternoon. All right. And this is
10
     on for a Rule 5 -- excuse me, it is on for the detention
11
    hearing.
12
               And did you want to proceed with that today, counsel?
13
               MR. SMITH: Yes, Your Honor.
14
               THE COURT: All right. Does the Government have
15
     anything to present, any evidence to present as to detention?
16
               MR. REDING: Yes, Your Honor. Before we start, I
17
     would like to correct the record. I mistakenly said all
18
     counts -- on Monday I mistakenly said all counts had a maximum
19
     sentence of 20 years.
20
               THE COURT: Okay.
21
               MR. REDING: Counts 1 through 4 have a maximum
22
     sentence of 20 years. And Counts 5 through 7 have a maximum
23
     sentence of 15 years.
24
               THE COURT: Okay. Did you have any witnesses you
25
    wanted to call as to detention?
```

the victim company that it was soliciting bids for products to be provided to the Middle East, sometimes to the United States

24

military abroad.

Based on these representations and after some negotiation, the victim companies would agree to provide their products at deeply discounted rates with the understanding that the products would be provided solely for export purposes. In fact, some of the victim companies' invoices explicitly stated that the prices provided were contingent on the buyer's representation that the merchandise would be exported and any sale of the product in the United States would constitute a fraud.

Unbeknownst to the victim companies, however, the products were never used in the Middle East or for the U.S. military. Rather, while the defendants were negotiating with victim companies they were simultaneously negotiating the sale of the victim companies' products to wholesalers in the United States for a significant profit.

In order to perpetuate this fraud and to show that the items were exported, the defendant either rerouted the shipment back to the United States or they had their own people pick up the products, take them to a U.S. warehouse, and then generate false export documentation.

As part of the investigation, law enforcement obtained e-mail search warrants which confirmed the fraud scheme of various individuals involved and their representative roles. These warrants reveal the defendant was the organizer

1 of the fraud scheme. The e-mails obtained, among other things, 2 show he directed various co-conspirators on what to do, 3 sometimes telling them exactly what to say to victim companies 4 when they would give any push-back to the fraudulent pitch, was 5 consulted on what was happening with each victim company. Sometimes he would introduce himself to the victim company 6 7 representatives as the owner of the soliciting company. And 8 lastly, he directed -- directly negotiated U.S.-based 9 wholesalers for the sale of the victim company products. 10 The fraud involved numerous interstate and foreign 11 wire transfers and e-mails. The investigation has revealed 12 approximately \$20 million in proceeds were received by the 13 defendants, much of which has been wired outside of the United 14 States. 15 Shipping records obtained confirmed that -- the 16 importation of numerous diverted shipments through Miami either 17 from the Port of Miami or Miami International. 18 Your Honor, that covers the basic fraud scheme. 19 the detention factors, the Government points to the nature and 20 circumstances of the offense charged, the weight of the 21 evidence against the defendant, and the history and 22 characteristics of the defendant. 23 The weight of evidence against the defendant is 24 significant. There are e-mails from the defendant directing

and instruction of the fraud. There are PowerPoint slides

specific instances of the presentence report that we feel do

24

```
8
 1
     like.
 2
               THE COURT: All right. All right.
 3
               MR. REDING: So he claims a residency here in -- or
 4
     an apartment here in D.C. of 2501 Pennsylvania Avenue,
 5
     Northwest, apartment 5C. He states to Probation that he lives
     there, he can live there rent free.
 6
 7
               While I only had an hour to review this presentence
 8
     report, basic Internet research shows that the apartment is
     valued -- last sold for $2.3 million in March of 2016. It
 9
10
     looks like it's owned by a shell corporation or a trust.
11
               In addition, he states in his -- he states to
12
     Pretrial Services that his company rents his warehouse in
13
     Georgia. That a warehouse was recently listed for $7 million
14
     and it's owned by one of his subsidiary companies. He states
15
     in Probation that he -- he owns Uniworld FZE. And if you check
16
     the company Web site, which I can provide printouts of the
17
     company Web site to the Court and defense counsel, one of the
18
     wholly-owned subsidiaries of Uniworld is Proton. Proton is the
19
     owner, according to County tax records, of this warehouse
20
     property which recently listed for $7 million.
21
               The Government --
22
               THE COURT: All right.
23
               MR. REDING: -- has nothing further on detention.
24
               THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
25
               Do you have argument?
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. SMITH: Your Honor, let me start with the comments made at the end. I was present during the Pretrial interview. It was not a presentence interview, obviously. Pretrial asked him what he personally owned in the United States. And the descriptions that he gave were answering that question, what he owned in the United States. Jason has talked about other items that may have been owned by other people, and let's address those. The apartment, he says it's worth a lot of money and it's owned by what he says is a shall company or a trust. Well, my client told the Pretrial officer it's owned by a trust. THE COURT: I saw that. MR. SMITH: There is no hiding of the ball here. that trust does give -- would give him the permission to stay there free. In terms of the renting of the warehouse and the ownership. Again, the fact that his company may have a subsidiary that owns the warehouse is not something that was asked nor was it discussed because it is not something he personally owns. It is a subsidiary of a company, and that is a question that was simply not asked.

He was accurate and truthful in the information he gave across the board. The Pretrial officer certainly had no disagreement with any of it.

And so, I wanted to start there by -- I mean, the

```
1
     suggestion that somehow he wasn't truthful is just not so.
 2
               Let me turn to a couple of the other things. And we
 3
     are going to want to call some witnesses --
 4
               THE COURT: I don't usually hear witness testimony.
 5
     Why would I need to hear witnesses? I've got the third-party
 6
     custodians here in the report.
               MR. SMITH: Well, Your Honor, I think Salerno, the
 7
 8
     Supreme Court case, gives us the ability to call witnesses at a
 9
     detention hearing.
10
               THE COURT: What are they going to add beyond what's
11
     in the Pretrial report?
12
               MR. SMITH: They are going to tell you how they know
13
     him -- there is an allegation that's been made by Jason just
14
     now that he does not have strong community contacts, and we
15
     want to establish that he does. The way to do that is --
               THE COURT: Well, I see he has several friends,
16
17
     certainly. And he has two children in the area who go to
18
     school.
               MR. SMITH: Yes.
19
20
               THE COURT: I understand that.
21
               MR. SMITH: And who those people are and the nature
22
     of how long they've known him and what their relationship is I
23
     think is important for the Court to hear.
24
               Before I get into that, quickly, if I might --
25
               THE COURT: I guess -- well, I'll come back to that
```

in a minute.

2 MR. SMITH: Okay.

THE COURT: Okay. Because I'm not sure that it's -- and I can accept your representations as to how they know him.

I don't need to have testimony about it. But if you want to make a proffer as to that, I accept that.

I am not sure that it affects the fundamental concerns that I have even if he does have several contacts here who can vouch for him. And maybe go to that because maybe it would help.

The problem that I have got is that in addition to this alleged fraud appearing to be significant and extensive, as far as his contacts and possible third-party custodians are concerned, his wife is only legally here until November. She wants to go back -- be able to go back to Dubai with the daughter. Understandable, but that doesn't help the situation.

So, effectively, she can't be a third-party custodian for him because of those problems even if I were -- even if she were to agree to not go to Dubai, the fact that she is only in the States legally, at least now until November, is a big problem.

The other -- all of the other third-party custodians have got problems in terms of their ability to supervise the defendant. And I know that at least one offered a secured bond. I don't think it's of an amount that is enough, to begin

with.

But as far as these people, even if they are totally suitable third-party custodians, and I don't doubt that they are, understandably because of their own personal situations I don't see how they can effectively supervise this defendant in a way that would give me any confidence that he is going to appear.

The issue here is certainly not danger to the community. The only issue here is -- is risk of non-appearance or flight.

And to get to the crux of the matter, I guess in terms of your argument, what I need to understand from you is how I'm going to possibly ensure that he would be able to do that.

The other issue is the defendant is actually charged in the Southern District of Florida.

MR. SMITH: Right.

THE COURT: And I don't see anything that would help me in terms of him residing with anybody in Florida. Normally we don't have people live somewhere other than where they are charged unless they, you know, are a U.S. citizen and have extensive ties.

But this is not very feasible to have him live
anywhere other than in Florida in terms of concerns of travel
back and forth. I don't even know how he would do that unless

```
1
    he drove. I mean, that's just not -- it's very problematic.
 2
               MR. SMITH: Well, he could have a custodian with him
 3
     when he goes. But let me, let me back up and try to go through
 4
    my arguments. I take the Court's --
 5
               THE COURT:
                          Okay.
 6
               MR. SMITH: -- concerns, and let me try to address
 7
     them.
 8
               THE COURT: I was just trying to focus us here on --
 9
     you know, I accept that he has got several people here who
10
     would vouch for him, who know him, who have known him for a
11
     while, who seem to be fine, upstanding citizens in this area.
12
     That doesn't address my concern though.
13
               So, I mean, if you want to put those people on, I
14
     will allow you to, but I don't think it's going to go to the
15
     crux of the matter, and I would accept your representations as
16
     to them.
17
               MR. SMITH: I appreciate that, Your Honor. Let me --
18
     let me try to go through some of your points and then we can
19
     maybe address that at the end.
20
               THE COURT: Okay.
21
               MR. SMITH: Let me start by discussing a few legal
22
     principles that are familiar to you, I'm sure, but worth
23
     repeating. Your options are, obviously, release on personal
24
     recognizance or release on a condition or combination of
25
     conditions for detention.
```

```
1
               THE COURT: Correct. I am well aware of that.
 2
               MR. SMITH: Release is appropriate unless you
 3
     determine a risk of flight or danger to the community. Here
 4
     there is no allegation of any danger to flee. The actual
 5
     standard is whether there is a serious risk of flight, not any
     risk.
 6
 7
               THE COURT: Yes.
 8
               MR. SMITH: And it's also not a certainty. It is not
 9
     an assurance. It is whether you can be reasonably assured of
10
     his appearance as required. Your obligation is to impose the
11
     least --
12
               THE COURT: Counsel, I do these every single week.
13
               MR. SMITH: Okay.
14
               THE COURT: So I don't need you to repeat them to me,
15
     although I appreciate it.
16
               MR. SMITH: Okay. This is -- let's start then with
17
     this. This is not a case involving a presumption of detention.
18
     None of the 3142 factors --
19
               THE COURT: No, correct.
20
               MR. SMITH: Bail is the presumption. Look at the
21
     four factors, and you know them. The first factor, let's look
22
     at it. 3142(g) says, look at the nature and circumstances of
23
     the offense, including whether the offense is a crime of
24
     violence. It's not. A violation of 1591. It's not. A
25
     federal crime of terrorism or involves a minor victim. It's
```

```
1
    not. Controlled substance. It's not. Firearm, explosive, or
 2
     destructive device. None of those including terms, not one,
 3
    exists here.
 4
               THE COURT: Yes.
 5
               MR. SMITH: This is a classic white collar offense,
 6
    no guns, drugs, no violence.
 7
               THE COURT: I agree.
 8
                          Indeed, I understand that the Government,
               MR. SMITH:
 9
     if you look at the offense, they are recommending bond on every
10
     other defendant in this case.
11
               THE COURT: I don't have any idea, and that's not my
12
     consideration. I take each defendant at a time. I have no
13
     idea what the other circumstances are as to the other
14
     defendants, and I can't factor that in.
15
               MR. SMITH: Yes, Your Honor.
16
               THE COURT: I can only look at this defendant and the
17
     conditions that I can fashion.
18
               MR. SMITH: No, I understand. But looking at the
     nature of the offense. The offense hasn't --
19
20
               THE COURT: Look, most white collar crimes we don't
21
     detain people unless we have to.
22
               MR. SMITH: Right.
23
               THE COURT: I understand that.
24
               MR. SMITH: Yeah.
25
               THE COURT: So let's move on.
```

MR. SMITH: But here, even this one, they're not recommending detention on anyone else, just him.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SMITH: And it's because of his citizenship and ties, I get that. Looking at the second factor, the weight of the evidence. He has given you a proffer, you know, this is all -- all I have is the indictment. There were, in his description of the factors, I will say, a lot of discussions about what they did and co-conspirators did as opposed to what my client himself supposedly did.

I look at the indictment, and this is the weight of the evidence looking at the indictment, look closer at the indictment, this is what it says. The core of this indictment involves reimportation of medical supplies and over-the-counter pharmaceuticals.

The FDA isn't claiming there was any safety issue involved with any of these drugs. It's purely a fraud case and a money loss case. The FDA's allegations of fraud are supposedly that the defendants collectively lied and fooled suppliers into selling medical items at deeply discounted rates that they charge for Third World sales by representing that the items wouldn't be sold into the U.S. even though planned to and did sell those at a big profit into the U.S.

Another way of characterizing it is that these so-called deep discounts on Third World prices for non-U.S.

sales are that the suppliers actually charge a premium -- the pharmaceutical companies charge a premium on U.S. sales. In political circles, there are certainly some who believe those premiums are unfair to U.S. consumers and that re-importations perhaps even should be allowed.

Here the FDA is not only defending those premiums charged on U.S. sales, but it's actually prosecuting these defendants for depriving the so-called victim companies of the extra premiums that U.S. consumers must bear. That is a political issue, I'll leave it alone.

I do not deny that they can -- have a right to prosecute if they can, if they can establish that the sales were perpetrated by fraud. But let's look at the charges.

Look at this document, which is all I can do before I heard the proffer. The allegations of my own client's actions are not well specified. The indictment, as I say, talks about what other -- he and other co-conspirators did.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. SMITH: What they supposedly arranged that others -- what he supposedly arranged that others who didn't even -- didn't even work in his company -- none of these people are alleged to even work in his company, but in their own separate organizations supposedly did.

And at page 5 in paragraph 5 there is an interesting item. While they're saying that the essence of the fraud is

that these defendants supposedly lied about the goods
purchased, how they would never be in the U.S., and that the
sellers were fooled, paragraph 5 also simultaneously says that
they insisted to the sellers that the good had to be -- the
goods being shipped had to be labeled and packaged for the U.S.
market. Supposedly they're representing that these are all
non-U.S. sales and their simultaneously telling the sellers
they had to be labeled and packaged for the U.S. market.

That requirement at a minimum, page 5, paragraph 5,
seems oddly inconsistent with the FDA's assertion that these
defendants were falsely representing that they had no intention
of ever selling these goods into the U.S. market.

And if you look at the actual wire fraud counts.

And if you look at the actual wire fraud counts, again, I have to just look at the indictment on page 3, there are only three wire fraud counts. And while Mr. Javat is charged in all three, the only one that names him directly is Count 3 where the FDA says he e-mailed a price list, e-mailed a prise list, that's the wire fraud count, to a man named G.F. in the United States. The other two he's not even supposedly on the wires. How e-mailing a price list rises to the level of wire fraud is not clear to me.

Now, look, I recognize that when you have an indictment, you naturally give deference to the grand jury's findings. I recognize they found probable cause. But neither do these charges look like a slam dunk kind of case in which

- 1 | showing up in Florida is going to be a pointless exercise.
- 2 From the indictment alone, just looking in the
- 3 | indictment, some defense themes have already naturally emerged.
- 4 And looking at the weight of the evidence generally, that
- 5 | factor didn't cause, as I say, the Government to seek detention
- 6 against any of the other co-defendants of this case who
- 7 | similarly are facing \$20 million supposedly or \$3 million in
- 8 profits that was lost.
- 9 Paragraph 9, for example, even talks about how Jim
- 10 | Sipprell and Emanuel George Daskos, but not my client,
- 11 | allegedly removed packaging stickers from certain shipments so
- 12 | that they could be sold into the U.S. market. Yet Mr. Sipprell
- was released after his arrest on Monday and he is being allowed
- 14 to report on his -- to his bond hearing voluntarily.
- The bottom line on the weight of the evidence is
- 16 this. The weight of the evidence as presented doesn't require
- detention here, especially since this is not even the kind of
- 18 case that gives rise to a presumption of detention. So that is
- 19 factor two.
- 20 Factor three. The third factor involving the history
- 21 and characteristics of the person. 31 --
- 22 THE COURT: I know he has no criminal history, I know
- 23 that.
- MR. SMITH: Well, let's go through these because they
- 25 matter. And I will try to be as quick as I can, really try and

be fast.

- The person's character is the first one. My client
- 3 has character witnesses, and we'd love to present them for
- 4 you --
- 5 THE COURT: I accept your representations on that,
- 6 | counsel. But again, my issue is -- I don't have an issue with
- 7 anything that you've said so far.
- 8 MR. SMITH: Okay.
- 9 THE COURT: Especially, I'm not so sure that I agree
- 10 | with you in terms of the assertion more or less that the acts
- of co-conspirators, I can't impute to this defendant, which
- 12 | I -- this is a conspiracy fraud case. But the issue that I go
- 13 | back to is who is going to be the third-party custodian and who
- 14 | is going to post a surety bond, that's the issue here.
- MR. SMITH: Okay.
- 16 THE COURT: Because that's what I'm lacking. And
- 17 | everything that you say, even if I accept everything you say as
- 18 | true and correct, and I think you are 90 percent of the way
- 19 | there, I don't have an appropriate third-party custodian and I
- 20 | don't have a surety bond in an amount that would be sufficient.
- 21 MR. SMITH: Well, if you -- I appreciate that. Let
- 22 me try to address them directly.
- The other custodian besides his wife is Stan Holmes,
- 24 and the two of them can tag team at least until November. Ms.
- 25 Nina Javat would also no doubt request an extension on her visa

```
21
 1
     to allow her to continue to serve as a custodian if necessary.
 2
               Stan Holmes is here today. He flew up from Dallas.
 3
     He is a person who is willing to also even co-sign the bond to
 4
     the extent of his resources he indicated --
 5
               THE COURT: He lives -- yeah, he lives in Dallas.
 6
               MR. SMITH: And he's here during the week. He also,
 7
     I think, might be willing to put him up in Dallas, but we
 8
     figured you would want him here, and that makes sense to us as
 9
     well.
10
               THE COURT: It does no good to have him here when the
11
     charges are in Florida. It does no good to have him in Dallas
12
     when the charges are in Florida.
13
               MR. SMITH: Okay.
14
               THE COURT: We have nobody in Florida.
15
               MR. SMITH: Understood. We would ask that the --
16
     Your Honor, in talking to Pretrial, I'm sorry, I think we were
     seeking to get him a custodian here, and I don't know that the
17
18
     issue of finding him a --
19
               THE COURT: Well, we can do that too, but we've got
20
     to deal with getting him back and forth to Florida. And that's
21
    problematic.
22
               And I think it's also problematic in that, you know,
23
     we've got -- Mr. Holmes said that he would be willing to assist
24
     with a secured bond up to 100,000. But, frankly, that's not
25
     enough. And, you know, if I were someone, I would not sign a
```

- secured bond for anyone for millions of dollars, which is what we're looking at here.
- And it just doesn't work to have a third-party custodian, frankly, who is not living with the defendant.
- 5 MR. SMITH: Well, I think --

THE COURT: And I can't find that his wife is a suitable third-party custodian, I cannot. I don't know exactly what their situation is, their marital situation is, but it is still his wife. And, you know, I can't assume, especially given her only having the ability to stay in the country right now until November, that there would not, you know, that they couldn't leave together.

Electronic monitoring is meaningless, frankly, when we're talking about this sort of thing. They cut the bracelet off and they're gone. So that doesn't help.

The only thing that would help is a third-party custodian whom I could trust actually living with the defendant, and we're talking about a million at least or more surety bond. And I don't have those things here. So this is a problem.

That's what my problem boils down to here, is nothing more than that.

MR. SMITH: Well, let me try to address that.

Obviously, we can't post the bond until it's set. I think we could find a way to get to the million dollar surety bond and

```
1
     get that posted working with a corporate surety.
 2
               THE COURT: Okay.
 3
               MR. SMITH: And so, I think that that could be met.
 4
     In terms of the residency, Stan Holmes is willing to reside
 5
     with him during the week. And I guess the --
               THE COURT: During the week is not enough.
 6
 7
               MR. SMITH: Understood. And I guess his wife --
 8
               THE COURT: Not -- I understand.
 9
               MR. SMITH: -- is a British citizen.
10
               THE COURT: But she can only be here until November,
11
     and then what happens?
12
               MR. SMITH: Well, I think before then we would need
13
     to come to the Court with a suitable alternative, and we would
14
     plan to do that.
15
               But in terms of releasing him -- I take your point
16
     about going to Florida, but between now and November, at most,
17
     there are going to be status hearings, he could go down for one
18
     day and be back. I don't think that it's a prohibitor to have
19
     him released to be here and then to go to the hearings, and
20
     then that we, we would continue --
21
               THE COURT: Putting that aside, who is my third-party
22
     custodian?
23
               MR. SMITH: The third-party custodians would be Nina
24
     Javat, his wife, and Stan Holmes, who would constantly -- and
25
     they are here and they could -- they could vouch for the fact
```

- 1 | that they will continue to monitor him and serve as custodian.
- 2 Between that and the electronic monitoring and the surety bond,
- 3 | I think that you can have reasonable assurance that he will
- 4 | show up for court.
- 5 And let me -- briefly, if I might, just -- his
- 6 | character is impeccable, Your Honor. We have a Lieutenant
- 7 | General here, Lieutenant General Kicklighter, who is the former
- 8 Department of Defense Inspector General, ready to vouch for
- 9 him.
- 10 We have a former congressman, Bob McEwen from Ohio
- 11 | who is here, again also has known him for many, many years,
- 12 ready to vouch for him.
- 13 Stan Holmes, who is from Dallas and is in a ministry,
- 14 | is willing to stay with him and has known him -- again, most of
- 15 | these people have known him like 15 years, they know his
- 16 family.
- 17 He has children here in the United States who are
- 18 going to college. One who is going to Johns Hopkins, his son.
- 19 And his daughter, who is going to the Rhode Island School of
- 20 Design.
- 21 His character, he has never been charged or even
- 22 | arrested with anything. He is almost 50 years old. His family
- 23 | ties are as rock solid as they get. We would like to put Nina
- 24 up to say this, but he has been married to one woman for
- 25 | 23 years. They have three children. As I say, two of them are

```
1
     at U.S. universities. If he were not to show up in Florida, he
 2
     would never be able to see his kids graduate. In terms of
 3
     employment, he has run his business for more than 20 years.
 4
               THE COURT:
                          Where does his wife actually live?
 5
               MR. SMITH: She lived with him in Dubai, which is
 6
     where their youngest daughter goes to school. But she is
 7
     willing to move here and stay with him and be his custodian as
 8
     necessary. The only reason she would go back is to straighten
 9
     up -- and both daughters are here. The youngest daughter, I
10
     understand, she may have to go to Dubai and her mom may need to
11
     stay behind.
12
               But as I say, he has run his company for more than
13
     20 years. Even if you buy everything the Government is saying,
14
     there is no suggestion that the first 16, 17 years of that
15
     running his business had any issues at all. So he has the
16
     successful long-term business. He actually has contracts with
17
     the Defense Department as well. He is on the Dunn's list.
18
     company does business with the Department of Defense.
19
               If he were to abscond, his 2 to $3 million of
20
     business that he does with the Defense Department would all go
21
     away, all of his contacts, all of his connections and
22
     relationships --
23
               THE COURT: If he is convicted of this --
24
               MR. SMITH:
                          I'm sorry?
25
               THE COURT: If he is convicted of this, that will be
```

the result as well.

MR. SMITH: Well, they're here notwithstanding the fact that he has been charged by a grand jury. So I think that they stand by him. But I understand the point, that it, obviously, would have an effect. But he knows for sure that if he were to become a fugitive, everyone is going to absolutely write him off and forever.

In terms of his length of residence in the community. Admittedly, he doesn't live in the U.S., but he does coming here frequently. He has come here for the last 15 years for the National Prayer Breakfast. He has gotten to know people, he interacts with them. He actually helps bring people to the National Prayer Breakfast from the Middle East. He was born in Pakistan. He provides -- well, he's -- let's just say he's a friend of the United States. He has been occasionally -- even talks to folks about relationships in the Pakistani/Afghan area we grew -- grew up.

His community ties, as I say, his witnesses are substantial. He is a good friend of the United States. And his witnesses are not only people that just are -- you know, pass the threshold for being a custodian, they are prominent people who have very stellar reputations and would not stand by him unless they believed in him and didn't know the kinds of help and kind of work that he did.

His past conduct is all positive. He runs a charity,

- actually, that builds schools in Pakistan where he grew up.

  His company, as I said, does work, DoD work. There is no

  suggestion he ever used any aliases. There is no suggestion

  that he attempted to flee when he was stopped. And in fact,

  the arresting officer took his Saint Kitts passport and he

  volunteered, oh, I also have this other passport, Pakistani
- 7 passport, which he gave to him. That's the reasons that they
- 8 have two passports instead of none, is because he volunteered.
- 9 He was totally cooperative. No suggestion of an attempt to 10 flee. Nothing like that.

And why would he? He has never been in trouble.

He's always been a law-abiding person. And these folks that I could bring up would vouch to that, that they believe that he has a character for being a law-abiding citizen. No criminal history whatsoever. Never been arrested in almost 50 years.

And in terms of his record concerning a court appearance -- his appearance at court hearings, he has never had to appear, but here he was. He has never absconded, and he certainly wasn't hiding out here in the U.S.

In fact, it's interesting, the FDA waited until the end of his trip to arrest him instead of the beginning of his trip. So the concern that he is somehow out there and that that's a problem or that he is a flight risk, they waited until he was about to leave for Canada even after he had been here in the United States for about eight or nine days before they

arrested him.

Those are all the (A) factors in this third prong.

On balance, they all strongly support a bond.

And (B) factors are in a different -- you are supposed to look whether he was on probation or parole or other release. The answer is no. Those factors strongly support the notion of bail, the history and characteristics of the person.

And then the fourth and final factor, of course, asks you to examine the nature and seriousness of the danger if he were to be released. And nobody is suggesting any danger --

THE COURT: I mean, I know -- that's not -- I know and understand it.

MR. SMITH: So all those factors support -- and of course, the Pretrial officer also is recommending that he get a corporate surety bond. So we hope that you will go along with that recommendation.

The presumption is bail should be given on charges like that. That presumption is infinitely strong when we're talking about a 45 -- 49-year-old man who has never been accused of anything, with a solid family, many community members willing to speak up on his behalf. He should not be the only one in this case without a bond. His decades of life as an upstanding member of the community should count for something. He shouldn't remain in jail when he is presumed innocent on these charges and there are reasonable assurances

- he would appear as required. As all these people who are in court that came today would say, that they believe he would show up for court as required.
  - And that's especially true if you add other conditions, like a secured bond, which we are agreeable to.

    Secured bond, custodians, electronic monitoring, relinquishment of passports, curfew, you name it, we are willing to comply.

    We are willing to try to do whatever is necessary to convince you and give you the kind of reasonable assurance you need that he will show up for court in Florida as he is required to do.
    - He has never done anything like not show up for anything in his life, and I don't think he is going to -- he is going start now.
- 14 THE COURT: Thank you. Does the Government have anything to add?
- MR. REDING: Your Honor, just briefly. Just a few things to note.
  - Obviously, his wife is a proposed third-party custodian on a tourist visa here only until November. I don't think it's workable. There is also -- what travel documents would he use to move around if he is not in the district that is prosecuting the case?
  - I think there is also a, you know, just a significant flight risk here. For example, in his Pretrial Preservices interview, he discloses approximately \$500,000 in income.

- However, defense counsel noted in defense contracts alone he's looking at two to \$3 million per year. A quick Internet search showed roughly \$10 million in assets in the United States.

  The third-party custodian that is proposed, Mr. Stan
- Holmes, is only willing to agree to up to \$100,000 in a secured bond. I will note just in this report alone, that he nearly has \$100,000 in cash in U.S. accounts, not including his accounts -- his accounts in foreign jurisdictions.
  - I think there is a significant flight risk. I believe that the defendant is one private jet away from escaping prosecution.
  - And particularly to address the issue, I don't know specifically about the other co-defendants being released on bond. I do know that they are U.S. citizens that have ties to the community, unlike the defendant who has no family, no family ties here. He has very short visits to the United States a few times a year. I don't believe these are significant community ties.
  - And as -- the overriding theme is he is a foreign national with multiple passports and vast financial resources.
- 21 THE COURT: All right, thank you.
  - I agree with virtually everything defense counsel has said about the defendant's danger to the community, his past, you know, not had any other charges ever against him. He has a lot of people who are willing to stand behind him who are

```
upstanding citizens, certainly.
```

My only concern here is risk of non-appearance. And I, frankly, think that there are not -- there has not been presented to me -- been to me -- been presented to me conditions that could satisfy that concern.

To go through it again, the defendant and his wife both are here just on temporary tourist visas. His wife can only stay, right now at least, until November. I can't be assured that she is going to stay past then. They have a minor child in Pakistan, I guess it is, who is going to school. I understand he has two children here who are attending college, but, frankly, that's not the kind of draw that I would want. I mean, that really has -- they're on their own, they're in college.

The defendant's employment is directly related to the alleged fraud. And the main problem that I come back to is even if he could come up with a corporate surety bond of a million or more, I don't have a suitable third-party custodian who could supervise him the way that I believe would have to be done in order to assure his appearance before the Court. Electronic monitoring in this situation is, frankly, meaningless. I think he has the means and the incentive to flee.

And I cannot at this time come up with conditions or a combination of conditions that would satisfy his appearance